

Serial No. **09/832,870**

Docket No. **LT-0002**

Amdt. dated March 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2006

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has amended claims 21, 34, 40, 55 and 61 to further clarify the invention. Claims 21-64 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 21-39, 61-62 and 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,929,849 (Kikinis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,818,935 (Maa). Claims 40-60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,467,093 (Inoue et al.) and further in view of Maa. Claim 63 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Maa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,771 (Rangan et al.). Claim 64 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Maa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,744,666 (Portuesi).

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 21-39, 61, 62 and 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Maa. The deficiencies of Kikinis have been discussed in Applicants' previously filed responses and, Applicant reasserts all arguments submitted in those responses. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and provide the following additional remarks.

Maa discloses a system for accessing the internet based on an internet information pointer encoded in a video signal. The system includes a video display adapted to display a video portion of the video signal. The system also includes an internet access device including a decoder adapted to extract the internet information pointer encoded in the video signal, the access device being adapted to connect to the internet to access the internet based on the extracted internet information pointer.

Regarding claims 21 and 61, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, comparing product identifying information received in the product information with previously stored product identifying information, or storing the product information including the received product identifying information only if the received product identifying information does not compare with the previously stored product identifying information. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested in Kikinis. Kikinis merely discloses providing URLs that are associated with images in TV presentations and transmitted between the transmitted frames of the TV presentation where the URLs are stripped and initiate access to the internet to a web page providing more information regarding the image. Kikinis does not disclose or suggest comparing product identifying information received in the product information with previously stored product identifying information, as recited in the claims of the present application. Moreover, Kikinis does not

Amdt. dated March 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2006

disclose or suggest storing the product information only if the received product identifying information does not compare with the previously stored product identifying information.

These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by Kikinis. Further, Maa does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 22-39, 62 and 65, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 21 and 61 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 21-39, 61, 62 and 65 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 40-60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Inoue et al. and further in view of Maa. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 40, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claims of, *inter alia*, a section filter in a television controller, the section filter comparing product identifying information received in the product information with previously stored product identifying information, or a memory storing the product information including the

received product identifying information only if the received product identifying information does not compare with the previously stored product identifying information. As noted previously, neither Kikinis nor Maa disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Moreover, Inoue et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kikinis and Maa.

Regarding claims 41-60, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 40 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 40-60 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 63 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Maa and further in view of Rangan et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claim 63 is dependent on independent claim 61 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Rangan et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kikinis and Maa.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 63 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 64 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Maa and further in view of Portuesi. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claim 64 is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicant submits that Portuesi does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kikinis and Maa.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 64 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Serial No. **09/832,870**

Docket No. **LT-0002**

Amdt. dated March 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 21-64 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey, Esq.
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: March 13, 2006

\\fk4\Documents\2031\2031-058\85471.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610